



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/689,991	10/13/2000	Bijan Farhang	Farhang 3-2/LUC-295	1021
32205	7590	11/18/2004	EXAMINER	
PATTI & BRILL ONE NORTH LASALLE STREET 44TH FLOOR CHICAGO, IL 60602			FERGUSON, KEITH	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2683	

DATE MAILED: 11/18/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	80
	09/689,991	FARHANG ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Keith T. Ferguson	2683	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 July 2004.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-24 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 8-24 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-7 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-3,5 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Griffith et al. in view of Saunders et al., newly recited reference.

Regarding claim 1, Griffith et al. discloses a method (fig. 5), comprising the steps of assigning a first number (538-3901) to a mobile station (112) that upon location of the mobile station at a first location (103) allows connection to the mobile station of a call that employs the first number (col. 2 lines 54-58); and assigning a second number (538-1902) to the mobile station (112) that upon location of the mobile station at a second location (104) allows connection to the mobile station of a call that employs the second number (col. 3 lines 10-16), wherein the second number (538-1902) differs from the first number (538-3901) , wherein the second location (104) differs from the first location (103) (location 103 and location 104) (col. 3 lines 1-35). Griffith et al. differs from claim 1 of the present invention in that it does not disclose assigning permanent first and second numbers to a mobile station; assigning permanent user zones and temporary user zones to the mobile station; employing the first permanent number for a connection when located in a first location; and employing the second permanent number for a connection when located in a second location or temporary zone. Saunders et al. teaches a communication device (fig. 1 number 12) comprising a plurality

Art Unit: 2683

of number assignment modules (NAMs) (col. 5 lines 34-55); each NAM comprising a first mobile identification number (MIN1) (permanent number) assigned to a first network (fig. 1 number 14) and a second mobile identification number (MIN2) (permanent number) assigned to a second network (fig. 1 number 16) stored within its memory (col. 5 lines 11-55); employing the first (NAM/MIN1) for a connection when located in a first location (home site) (col. 4 lines 35-54); and employing the second (NAM/MIN2) permanent number for a connection when located in a second location or temporary zone (visitor or roam system) (col. 4 lines 35-54). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Griffith et al. method with assigning permanent first and second numbers to a mobile station; assigning permanent user zones and temporary user zones to the mobile station; employing the first permanent number for a connection when located in a first location; and employing the second permanent number for a connection when located in a second location or temporary zone in order for the wireless terminal to have assigned telephone numbers when working at multiple locations, which saves the wireless switching system processing and resources by not having to reassign telephone numbers to the wireless terminal based upon its location, as taught by Saunders et al..

Regarding claim 2, Griffith et al. discloses the step of selecting the second location to comprise a location that is noncontiguous (separate location or different room) with the first Location (fig. 1 number 103 and 104).

Regarding claim 3, Griffith et al. discloses the step of selecting the first number to correspond to a first user zone that comprises the first location (col. 2 lines 54-58); and the step of selecting the second number to correspond to a second user zone that comprises the second location (col. 3 lines 10-18), wherein the second user zone differs from the first user zone (separate locations or different rooms) (fig. 1 number 103 and 104).

Regarding claim 5, Griffith et al. discloses the step of selecting the second number to allow only calls that employ the second number (538-1902) to be, contemporaneously with location

Art Unit: 2683

of the mobile station in a temporary user zone (based upon the fix unit in area 104) that comprises the second location, originated and/or terminated in the temporary user zone (based upon the fix unit in area 104) (col. 2 lines 26-58 and col. 3 lines 1-34).

Regarding claim 7, Griffith et al. discloses step of assigning a particular number to the mobile station that upon location of the mobile station at any one of a plurality of locations allows connection to the mobile station of a call that employs the particular number (fig. 2 and col. 3 lines 1-26), wherein the particular number differs from the first number, wherein each location of the plurality of locations differs from the first location (fig. 2 and col. 3 lines 1-26).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Griffith et al. in view of Saunders et al. as applied to claim 1 above and in further view of Bansal et al..

Regarding claim 4, the combination of Griffith et al. and Saunders et al. differs from claim 4 of the present invention in that they do not explicit disclose the step of selecting a discounted billing rate for the call that employs the second

Art Unit: 2683

number. Bansal et al. teaches the step of selecting a discounted billing rate for the call that employs the second number (col. 5 lines 40-56 and col. 6 lines 1-12). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the combination of Griffith et al. and Saunders et al. with the step of selecting a discounted billing rate for the call that employs the second number in order to save money based upon a calling plan between the wireless terminal and its carrier, as taught by Bansal et al..

5. Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Griffith et al. in view of Saunders et al. as applied to claim 1 above and in further view of in view of Chavez, Jr..

Regarding claim 6, the combination of Griffith et al. and Saunders et al. differs from claim 6 of the present invention in that they do not disclose the step of directing to voice mail, upon location of the mobile station at the second location, a call that employs the first number. Chavez, Jr. Teaches the step of directing to voice mail, upon location of the mobile station at the second location (wireless terminal leaves first location), a call that employs the first number (col. 5 lines 34-50). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the combination of Griffith et al. and Saunders et al. with the step of directing to voice mail, upon location of the mobile station at the second location, a call that employs the first number in order for the wireless terminal to replay the first number message and decide whether to respond to the message, as taught by Chavez, Jr..

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments filed July 21, 2004 have been fully considered but they are not deemed to be persuasive. The following are explanations to the applicant arguments:

1. Argument: Applicant alleges that Griffith do not disclose the first and second numbers assigned to wireless terminal 112 as it moves from a first location to second location should be made permanent.

Explanation: Examiner respectfully agrees with applicant. Saunder teaches this limitation in claim 1 rejection.

2. Argument: Applicant alleges that there is no teaching or motivation to combine Griffith and Saunders et al..

Explanation: Examiner respectfully disagrees, in response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teaching of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. It is not necessary that the reference actually suggest, expressly or in so many words the changes or improvements that applicants has made. The test for combine references is what the references as a whole would have suggested to one of ordinary skill in the art. In the Griffith et al. reference, the telephone numbers are assigned to the wireless terminal as the wireless terminal moves to different locations so that the wireless terminal could be contacted in that location. The Saunder et al. reference teaches permanent telephone numbers are stored within the mobile device to be used at multiple locations. The Saunder et al. reference is used to modify the Griffith in that the base station would not have to assign the wireless terminal a telephone number each time the wireless terminal moves because the telephone numbers are permanent stored within the wireless terminal memory and could be selected by the user of the wireless terminal without using wireless resources by communicating with the base station.

Conclusion

7. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Keith T. Ferguson whose telephone number is (703) 305-4888. The examiner can normally be reached on 6:30am-5:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, William Trost can be reached on (703) 308-5318. The fax phone number for the

Art Unit: 2683

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is
703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Keith Ferguson
Art Unit 2683
November 4, 2004




WILLIAM TROST
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600